

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 6-20 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2 and 5 have been canceled. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 3. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to depend from claim 6. Claim 14 has been amended slightly to define the invention more clearly. In particular, the phrase "and in series" has been added to describe the function of the memory device and to clarify the previously stated limitation that the memory device time-sequentially stores the operating information repeatedly extracted by the extractor. It is believed that this minor clarifying change to the previously recited words "time-sequentially" and "repeatedly" does not add new matter, does not raise new issues and will not require further searching or consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, the entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection is believed to be proper and is requested.

The assignee is pleased to note that claims 3, 6, 10-13, 19 and 20 have been allowed. Those claims remain in the application without further amendment.

Previously rejected dependent claim 4 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 3. Accordingly, claim 4 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Previously rejected dependent claims 7-9 now depend from allowed claim 6. Accordingly, claim 7-9 also are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 14-18 remain in the application and have been finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tazumi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,392,537. The office action explained the perceived relevancy of the Tazumi et al. reference to claim 14.

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 14-18 is requested in view of the minor amendment to claim 14 presented above and in view of the following comments. In particular, column 6, lines 24-30 of Tazumi et al. and FIG. 2 of Tazumi et al. only show that the CPU 14 controls the door, self-diagnoses or inspects the automatic door system for failure and communicates with a maintenance station. RAM 18 stores data to be used for this Tazumi et al. process. However, the Tazumi et al. reference does not show the claimed "operating information extractor which extracts repeatedly at intervals, from the controller, operating information of the automatic door apparatus including sensor state information indicating a detected state of the sensor and door state information indicating an open/close control state of the door, the door state information being cooperatively associated with the sensor state information." The Tazumi et al. reference does not explain the type of data that the RAM 18 stores. Rather, the Tazumi et al. reference explains at column 6, lines 56-65 that inspection of EEPROM 20, ROM 16 and RAM 18 is carried out, motor current is inspected by the output of a motor current detector, overheating of the motor is inspected by the output of the temperature detector, and breakage of a motor belt, disconnection of encoder lines and abnormality of magnetic force are inspected by the output of an encoder. However, this aspect of Tazumi et al. fails to show a device "which time-sequentially and in series stores the operating information repeatedly extracted by the extractor."

In view of the above, it is submitted that the Tazumi et al. reference does not show a memory device that stores operating information as claimed in amended claim 14. In contrast, claim 14 defines an automatic door apparatus with a memory device which time-sequentially and in series stores the operating information repeatedly extracted by the

extractor. With this claimed feature, the claimed invention stores log data of a series of operating information representing a history of operation of an automatic door, such as the door disclosed in paragraphs 0143-0145 of the subject application. These historical log data enable service personnel to determine how the malfunction of an automatic door occurred, as explained in paragraph 0161 and 0162 of the subject application. This aspect of the invention provides a very significant advance over the teaching of Tazumi et al., and accordingly claims 14-18 are believed to be directed to patentable subject matter.

To summarize, the assignee is pleased that claims 3, 4, 6-13, 19 and 20 are allowed. It is believed that claims 14-18, as amended, should be allowed as well for the reasons set forth above. The Examiner is urged to contact applicants attorney at the number below to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.
Atty. Reg. No. 30,066
Customer No. 001218
CASELLA & HESPOS LLP
274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703
New York, NY 10016
Tel. (212) 725-2450
Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: July 6, 2005